

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-10 and 14-17 were pending for consideration in this application. By the foregoing amendment, Applicant has cancelled Claims 1-17. New Claims 18-22 have been added. Claims 18-22 are now pending.

Applicant notes the Office Action Summary has both the FINAL and NON-FINAL boxes checked. In PAIR, the Office Action included in the file wrapper is recorded as being non-final, while in the transaction history it is indicated to be final. In a telephone interview, Examiner Abraham indicates the Office Action is Final. Applicant therefore is responding with this amendment along with a Request for Continued Examination.

The Examiner objected to the drawings because certain legends do not exactly match the terminology used in the specification. Applicant finds no such requirement in the MPEP. In fact, 37 CFR 1.84(o) specifically instructs “*Legends*. Suitable descriptive legends may be used subject to approval by the Office, or may be required by the examiner where necessary for understanding of the drawing. They should contain as few words as possible.”

In the case of reference 225 “Bit Unit”, this legend is descriptive using few words.

In the case of reference 226, “Interrupt Request Flag” is a descriptive legend that does not need the extra word “unit.”

In the case of reference 221, “Erase Condition Valid Flag” is a descriptive legend that does not need the extra word “unit.”

Applicant therefore respectively declines to amend the drawings as no amendment is needed to comply with 37 CFR 1.84.

The Examiner noted several typos and discrepancies in the specification which are amended herein, along with additional items found by Applicant. No new matter is added since all amendments are obvious typos or clearly understandable from the as-filed application.

The Examiner has made numerous rejections under 35 USC 112, first and second paragraphs. Several of these rejections relate to differences in exact terminology between the claims as amended and the specification. Again, Applicant finds no requirement in the MPEP, regulations or statutes requiring exact terminology coincidence. In fact, the MPEP explicitly does not require coincidence. For example, refer to MPEP 2163.02 which states:

The subject matter of the claim need not be described literally (i.e., using the same terms or *in haec verba*) in order for the disclosure to satisfy the description requirement. If a claim is amended to include subject matter, limitations, or terminology not present in the application as filed, involving a departure from, addition to, or deletion from the disclosure of the application as filed, the examiner should conclude that the claimed subject matter is not described in that application.

In this case, the claim amendments did not involve “a departure from, addition to, or deletion from the disclosure of the application as filed.”

In order to progress with this examination, Applicant has canceled the pending claims and rewritten them in hopefully a more clear recitation, thereby rendering the rejections under 35 USC 112, first and second paragraphs moot. In so doing, Applicant’s new claims do not involve “a departure from, addition to, or deletion from the disclosure of the application as filed” and therefore do not require term coincidence.

The pending Claims were rejected under 35 USC 102 as allegedly being anticipated by Abdoo, US 5,490,155. Applicant’s new independent Claim 18 recites: “...interrupt circuitry operable to selectively signal an interrupt, such that an interrupt is signaled when the ECC circuitry determines the error in the signal group resulted from a bit signal that should be in the first state but was instead in the second state, and such

that an interrupt is not signaled when the ECC circuitry determines the error in the signal group resulted from a bit signal that should be in the second state but was instead in the first state.” Abdoo has no teaching or suggestion of such a selective interrupt circuit. Abdoo’s correctable error (CERR) interrupt and uncorrectable error (ECERR) are always sent without consideration to the state of the bit in error. New Claim 18 is therefore allowable over Abdoo.

Dependent Claims 19-22 depend directly or ultimately on allowable Claim 18 and are allowable for this reason and by virtue of their further distinctive recitations. For example, Claim 19 recites: “...an address latch coupled to the address input to hold an address of the signal group having an error...” Applicant finds no suggestion of such a latch in Abdoo. Claim 29 is therefore allowable for this additional reason.

Claim 21 recites: “ ... restoring a charge on a failing memory bit location in the main memory or in the ECC memory by writing to the address provided by the address latch.” Applicant finds no suggestion of such operation in Abdoo. Claim 21 is therefore allowable for this additional reason.

Claim 22 recites: “...detection circuitry operable to determine when a signal group stored in the main memory and in the error signal memory are all logic "1"s.” Applicant finds no suggestion of such operation in Abdoo. Claim 21 is therefore allowable for this additional reason.

Applicant believes this application and the claims herein to be in a condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the Examiner allow this application to pass to the issue branch.

Applicant believes that no additional fee is due at this time; however, please charge any additional fee(s) or underpayments of fee(s) under 37 CFR 1.16 and 1.17 relating to this matter to Deposit Account Number 20-0668, for Texas Instruments Incorporated.

Should the Examiner have further inquiry concerning these matters, please contact the below named attorney for Applicant.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gerald E. Laws/

Gerald E. Laws
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 39268
713-937-8823

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-5287